

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/726,858	WALKER, PAUL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Herng-der Day	2128	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Herng-der Day. (3) _____.

(2) Ronald R. Demsher (Reg. No.: 42,478). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-3, 5, 10-13, 15 and 20-30.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

1. The Examiner suggested Applicant to (1) incorporate claim 2 into claim 1; (2) incorporate claim 12 into claim 11; (3) incorporate claim 22 into claim 21; (4) clarify in claims 1, 11, and 21, "determining that operands in instructions of the program code for the subject machine require a higher precision than provided for by the hardware of the target machine"; (5) clarify that claims 21-30 are system claims; and (6) amend claims 3, 5, 10, 13, 15, 20, and 23-30 to avoid potential 112 issues.
2. Applicant's Attorney agreed to review and consider the suggestions with client.